UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/520,000	08/05/2005	Gerd Mossakowski	P-57 MG	5129	
	7590 07/16/200 H SIEGEL, LLP	8	EXAMINER		
LACKENBAC	H SIEGEL BUILDING	i	LERNER, MARTIN		
1 CHASE ROA SCARSDALE,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/16/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/520,000	MOSSAKOWSKI, GERD	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MARTIN LERNER	2626	
	10/520,000 Examiner	10/520,000 MOSSAKOWSKI, G Examiner Art Unit

	MARTIN LERNER	2626	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wear the Notice of Appeal has been filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further col	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet _ appeal; and/or 	· ·	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12.5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Martin Lerner/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2626	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Atlas, Applicant's basic argument that the claimed groups are somehow fundamentally different from musical notes is traversed. The Specification, Page 2, Last Sentence, clearly states that the audio signal can be either a sound source from a musical instrument or a human voice. Similarly, Applicant's Specification Page 3, 5th ¶, discusses a group as an array of frequencies corresponding to a tone pitch. One skilled in the art could clearly see that a group, as claimed, can be defined in terms of a musical note consisting of either one pitch frequency or a plurality of pitch frequencies because the array has dimensions of both frequency and time. Nor is there anything in the claims that limits an intended use to audio signals from a human voice or noise, or to only one frequency.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4 to 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Atlas in view of Levine et al., it is maintained that there is ample motivation to combine as expressly set forth by Levine et al. to meet the standard of either KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., or any prior standard of obviousness. Briefly, it is maintained that it is known to employ art recognized alternative filters and interpolation of lost values as taught by Levine et al.